



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,071	08/02/2001	Hatim Y. Amro	16356.647 (DC-03057)	5244
27683	7590	01/11/2006		
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100 DALLAS, TX 75202			EXAMINER PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/921,071

Applicant(s)

AMRO ET AL.

Examiner

Ashok B. Patel

Art Unit

2154

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 20 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-30.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See continuation sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**

Continuation Sheet:

**Rejections Under U.S.C. § 102(b)**

**Applicant's argument:**

"Independent claims 1, 11 and 21 include:

Claim 1. ... the identifier being removed from the computer system.

Claim 11. ... removing the identifier from the computer system for reuse.

Claim 21. ... causing a script associated with the identifier to be executed to cause one or more software components to be installed onto the computer system, whereby the identifier is removed from the computer system for reuse in installing software onto other computer systems." And "Applicants respectfully submit that since the bar coded ID is attached to the PC it is not apparent how the office action concludes that "the identifier is being removed from the system". The step of reading the bar coded ID with a bar code reader does not 'remove' the bar coded ID attached to the PC, as asserted by the office action. On the contrary, Imai (FIG. 3 and col. 9, lines 19-21) states, "When the assembly is completed, the hardware configuration information is written in the nonvolatile memory in the PC". Thus, Imai teaches away from the 'removing the identifier from the computer system' and the 'reuse' limitation of the identifier recited in Claims 1, 11 and 21.

**Examiner's response:**

Claim 1 recites : " a device coupled to the port, the device including the identifier,".....and "the identifier being removed from the computer system for reuse."

Claim 11 recites: "reading an identifier from a device coupled to a port of a computer

Art Unit: 2154

System; providing the identifier to a server;" .....and "removing the identifier from the computer system for reuse."

Claim 22 recites: "reading an identifier from a device coupled to a port of the computer system; providing the identifier to a server; and...., whereby the identifier is removed from the computer system for reuse in installing software onto other computer systems.

Examiner has already identified in the Office Action Dated 04/29/2005, "the device including the identifier" as being the Fig. 3, item 40 and 40a.

The embodiment of Fig. 3 as previously indicated uses the bar code that is attached to the PC as terminal ID to provide it to the server, which is being read by the bar code reader (which is not part of the part of the Table 1, "Information Installation Table shown in col. 8). and Imai, for this embodiment never teaches that this terminal ID is kept inside the PC, rather it specifically teaches that " the identifier is being removed from the computer by providing it to the server and not stored into the terminal (PC) itself. (col. 10, line 8-14).

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

**Applicant's argument:**

"Since, Imai teaches away from 'removing the identifier from the computer system for reuse' limitation, there would be no motivation to combine Imai, Oki, Donohue and Chiloyan considered individually or in combination."

**Examiner's response:**

Art Unit: 2154

The references combined with Imai do provide the motivation as stated in the previous Office Action stating the benefits for their combination to Imai. Please also refer to the response stated above for claims 1, 11 and 21.